



To: Legislative Action Committee and Board of Directors
From: Raania Mohsen, Executive Director
Date: September 6, 2016
Re: Review of Statewide Ballot Propositions November 2016

At the September 2, 2016 Executive Board Meeting, Members suggested bringing forward seven of the eighteen statewide propositions impacting cities for review by the Legislative Action Committee and Board of Directors. Noted below are the propositions suggested for review, opposing and supporting arguments, the Legislative Analyst's Office estimate of fiscal impact, and related Cities Association's actions or related positions. For more information regarding text of the measures and supporting and opposing arguments, please see https://ballotpedia.org/California_2016_ballot_propositions.

Also attached for supplemental review are ballot recommendations from the League of California Cities, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, and League of Women Voters.

Please note, the Cities Association already reviewed and took positions on the following Measures/Propositions: Measure A Santa Clara County Affordable Housing Bond (support), Measure B Silicon Valley Transportation Tax Measure (support), and Proposition 53 State Bond Initiative (oppose).

1. Proposition 51: California Public Education Facilities Bond Initiative

Summary

Authorizes \$9 billion in general obligation bonds for new construction and modernization of K-12 public school facilities; charter schools and vocational education facilities; and California Community Colleges facilities.

- \$3 billion for the construction of new school facilities;
- \$500 million for providing school facilities for charter schools;
- \$3 billion for the modernization of school facilities;
- \$500 million for providing facilities for career technical education programs; and
- \$2 billion for acquiring, constructing, renovating, and equipping community college facilities.
- This will be the first education-related bond measure to appear on the ballot since 2006, and it is the first ever education-related bond measure that was citizen initiated.

Supporting Arguments/Supporters

- Many community colleges, high schools, and elementary schools are in need of maintenance or replacement in order to meet standards for earthquake safety, fire safety, and health risks, such as asbestos and lead paint.
- Proposition 51 would be fiscally responsible and contain many taxpayer protection and accountability measures.
- Improving and expanding community colleges would make affordable education accessible to more California residents, including veterans.
- Improvements to the education system would be a good investment because it would make good jobs available to more California residents and reduce college debt, thereby boosting the economy.
- Supporters include Assembly Member Evan Low, Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, CA State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson, Los Altos Chamber of Commerce, Foothill De Anza Community College District, Sunnyvale School District, Bay Area Council, CA State PTA, California Taxpayers Association, California Democratic Party, California Republican Party.

Opposing Arguments/Opponents

- The bond proposition proposes putting California further into debt, which the state can't afford.
- Local control over spending allows for the most accountability and efficiency; the bond proposition would give state officials control over the bond money, instead of providing local control over the funds.
- Local school bonds are more effective than state school bonds, and local voters have shown willingness to approve local school debt, making a statewide bond proposition unnecessary.
- Proposition 51 does not guarantee equitable distribution of the bond money, giving well-funded school districts with consultants a better chance of applying for and receiving money than smaller and poorer districts.
- Proposition 51 was written and sponsored by construction companies to benefit construction companies by providing \$9 billion in state spending from which they could profit.
- Opponents include: Governor Jerry Brown and California Taxpayers Action Network

Cities Association Related Actions/Positions

- Cities Association has not taken previous action related to school facilities
- LCC: No Position

Legislative Analyst's Office

State costs of about \$17.6 billion to pay off both the principal (\$9 billion) and interest (\$8.6 billion) on the bonds. Payments of about \$500 million per year for 35 years.

2. Proposition 54: California Transparency Act of 2016

Summary

Prohibits legislature from passing any bill unless published on Internet for 72 hours before vote. Requires Legislature to record its proceedings and post on Internet. Authorizes use of recordings.

Supporting Arguments/Supporters

- The proposition would not cost taxpayers any new money, the existing budget would cover the measure's costs.
- The proposition would increase transparency in California's state government.
- The proposition would stop the practice of "gutting and amending" legislation.
- Several California city legislatures already follow the practice of posting recordings of their sessions online.
- Supporters include League of California Cities, League of Women Voters, San Jose/Silicon Valley NAACP.

Opposing Arguments/Opponents

- The proposition would serve the interests of the billionaire funding the initiative.
- The proposition would introduce unnecessary restrictions on the law crafting process in the legislature.
- The proposition would hinder legislators' ability to develop bipartisan solutions for issues.
- The proposition would give special interests too much power in regards to the legislative process.
- The proposition would increase taxpayer costs.
- The proposition would increase the use of political attack advertisements.
- Opponents include California Democratic Party, California Labor Federation.

Cities Association Related Actions/Positions

N/A

Legislative Analyst's Office

One-time costs of \$1 million to \$2 million and ongoing costs of about \$1 million annually to record legislative meetings and make videos of those meetings available on the Internet.

3. Proposition 57: Public Safety And Rehabilitation Act of 2016

Summary

Allows parole consideration for nonviolent felons. Authorizes sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, and education. Provides juvenile court judge authority to decide whether juvenile will be prosecuted as adult.

Supporting Arguments/Supporters

- The proposition would provide a sustainable way to reduce California's overcrowded prison population while rehabilitating juvenile and adult inmates.
- The proposition would still keep dangerous offenders in prison.
- The proposition would save taxpayers millions of dollars.
- The proposition would be better than the status quo because it addresses evidence-based rehabilitation for juveniles and adults.
- Supporters include Governor Jerry Brown, Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, League of Women Voters, California Democratic Party, SEIU State Council.
- LCC position TBD.

Opposing Arguments/Opponents

- The proposition was poorly drafted and would allow criminals convicted of crimes like rape, lewd acts against a child, and human trafficking to be released early from prison.
- The proposition would allow career criminals to be treated as first offenders.
- The proposition would overturn provisions of victims' rights legislation like Marsy's Law, "three strikes," Victim's Bill of Rights, and the Californians Against Sexual Exploitation Act

- The proposition would force victims to relive their experience more often with more parole hearings.
- The proposition could result in higher crime rates.
- The proposition would place the new privileges for criminals in the California Constitution, making it more difficult for the legislature to change the language if necessary.
- Opponents include California Police Chiefs Association, California Peace Officers, District Attorney's throughout the state.

Cities Association Related Actions/Positions

- In 2014, Cities Association adopted priority included public safety and realignment; as an effort to enhance public safety within communities, Cities Association collaborated with the county, local police chiefs, and state legislators on addressing the impacts of AB 109 Realignment.

Legislative Analyst's Office

Net state savings likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, depending on implementation. Net County costs of likely a few million dollars annually.

4. Proposition 63: Safety for All Act of 2016

Summary

Requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition. Prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines. Establishes procedures for enforcing laws prohibiting firearm possession by specified persons. Requires Department of Justice's participation in federal National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Supporting Arguments/Supporters

- The proposition would keep guns and ammunition out of the wrong hands by closing loopholes in existing law.
- The proposition would protect the rights of law-abiding citizens to own guns for self-defense, hunting, and recreation.
- The proposition would address the issue of illegally armed felons.
- Supporters include Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, Assembly Member Evan Low, San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo, California Democratic Party, California League of Women Voters

Opposing Arguments/Opponents

- The proposition would burden law-abiding citizens who own firearms.
- The proposition would not keep terrorists and violent criminals from accessing firearms and ammunition.
- The proposition would divert resources away from local law enforcement and burden an already overburdened court system.
- The proposition would make Californians less safe and would waste public resources and money.
- The proposition would be difficult for the legislature to amend.
- Opponents include NRA, CA Correctional Peace Officers Association.

Cities Association Related Actions/Positions

N/A

Legislative Analyst's Office

Increased state and local court and law enforcement costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually, related to a new court process for removing firearms from prohibited persons after they are convicted.

5. Proposition 64: Marijuana Legalization Initiative Statute

Summary

Legalizes marijuana under state law, for use by adults 21 or older. Imposes state taxes on sales and cultivation. Provides for industry licensing and establishes standards for marijuana products. Allows local regulation and taxation.

Supporting Arguments/Supporters

- The proposition has specific safeguards that would protect children while allowing responsible use of adult marijuana.
- The proposition would incorporate best practices from other states that already legalized marijuana use and would adhere to recommendations provided by California's Blue Ribbon Commission on Marijuana Policy.
- The proposition would generate tax revenue and decrease law enforcement costs, providing funding for things like afterschool programs, drug prevention education and drug/alcohol addiction treatment, law enforcement training and research on impaired driving, and other programs.
- The proposition would prevent legislators from using generated revenue for their pet projects.
- The proposition would provide an environment where marijuana is safe, controlled, and taxed.
- Supporters include California Democratic Party, ACLU of California, State Senator Mark Leno

Opposing Arguments/Opponents

- The proposition would result in more highway fatalities and more impaired driving.
- The proposition would allow marijuana growing near schools and parks, and would erode local control.
- The proposition would increase black market and drug cartel activity.
- The proposition would allow marijuana smoking advertisements to be aired.
- The proposition would hurt underprivileged neighborhoods.
- Opponents include California Police Chiefs Association, California District Attorney's Association, California Hospital Association

Cities Association Related Actions/Positions

- May 12, 2011, Cities Association Board of Directors endorsed a template resolution, to be further reviewed and supported by member cities, calling for the federal government to reclassify medicinal marijuana as a drug to be regulated and distributed through licensed, regulated pharmacies, if distribution should occur at all within the State of California; http://www.citiesassociation.org/presentations-and-actions_30_3596159.pdf.
- Today, the City of San Jose is the only jurisdiction in the County that allows medical marijuana collectives.

Legislative Analyst's Office

Additional tax revenues ranging from high hundreds of millions of dollars to over \$1 billion annually, mostly dedicated to specific purposes. Reduced criminal justice costs of tens of millions of dollars annually.

6. Proposition 65: Carryout Bags, Charges, Initiative Statute

Summary

Redirects money collected by grocery and certain other retail stores through mandated sale of carryout bags. Requires stores to deposit bag sale proceeds into a special fund to support specified environmental projects.

Supporting Arguments/Supporters

- The proposition would stop the deal made between legislators and lobbyists that allowed grocery stores to keep plastic bag fee revenue as extra profits.
- The proposition would dedicate plastic bag fee revenue to environmental projects like drought relief and litter removal, and would make the California Wildlife Conservation Board responsible for allocating the revenue generated from plastic bag fees.

Opposing Arguments/Opponents

- The proposition would only serve the interests of plastic bag companies and would distract from phasing out plastic bags entirely.
- The proposition would do little to help the environment, as plastic bags need to be eliminated completely in order to have an effective impact.
- This is not about helping fund environmental programs but is simply intended to cause enough voter confusion that the more significant environmental measure, Proposition 67, fails.
- *San Jose Mercury News*: "And vote no on Proposition 65, one of the most disingenuous ballot measures in state history -- and that's saying something. The proposition requires that the money shoppers pay for paper bags in stores go into an environmental fund -- but major environmental groups actively oppose it."
- Opponents include League of California Cities.

Cities Association Related Actions/Positions

N/A

Legislative Analyst's Office

Potential state revenue of several tens of millions of dollars annually under certain circumstances, with the monies used to support certain environmental programs.

7. Proposition 67: Plastic Bag Ban Veto Referendum

Summary

A "Yes" vote approves, and a "No" vote rejects, a statute that prohibits grocery and other stores from providing customers single-use plastic or paper carryout bags but permits sale of recycled paper bags and reusable bags. If Proposition 67 is approved by the state's voters, it would:

- Ratify Senate Bill 270 (2014).
- Prohibit large grocery stores and pharmacies from providing plastic single-use carryout bags and ban small grocery stores, convenience stores and liquor stores from doing so the following year.

- Allow single-use plastic bags for meat, bread, produce, bulk food and perishable items.
- Mandate stores to charge 10 cents for recycled, compostable and reusable grocery bags.
- Exempt consumers using a payment card or voucher issued by the California Special Supplemental Food Program from being charged for bags.
- Provide \$2 million to state plastic bag manufacturers for the purpose of helping them retain jobs and transition to making thicker, multi-use, recycled plastic bags.

Supporting Arguments/Supporters

- The proposition would help the environment by reducing litter, protecting oceans and wildlife, and reducing clean-up costs.
- The proposition would continue California's success in phasing out plastic bags.
- The proposition is opposed by four large out-of-state plastic bag companies.
- Supporters include League of California Cities, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, CA Democratic Party.

Opposing Arguments/Opponents

- The proposition would cost consumers more money, as they would be required to pay 10 cents per bag for paper or thicker plastic reusable bags at checkout.
- The proposition would not allocate revenue generated from reusable bag fees for helping the environment, the revenue would go to grocers as extra profit.

Cities Association Related Actions/Positions

- June 9, 2011, Cities Association Board of Directors endorsed the Subcommittee on Single-Use Bags (Jim Griffith, Steve Tate, Jason Baker) recommendations to adopt a common vision and regional strategy on the ban of single-use bags. The recommendations were forwarded to all membership jurisdictions for consideration.
- http://www.citiesassociation.org/presentations-and-actions_36_1353436725.pdf
- In 2007, San Francisco became the first jurisdiction in California to ban single-use plastic bags. Since then, 108 ordinances banning single-use plastic bags have been approved in the state, covering 137 county or local jurisdictions.
- In Santa Clara County the following 12 jurisdictions have banned single-use bags: Campbell, Cupertino, Los Altos, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Morgan Hill, Mountain View, Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa Clara, Santa Clara County, and Sunnyvale
- There were initiative attempts to overturn local single-use plastic bag bans in Walnut Creek, Huntington Creek and Campbell, California. All were unsuccessful in their signature drives.

Legislative Analyst's Office

Relatively small fiscal effects on state and local governments, including a minor increase in state administrative costs and possible minor local government savings from reduced litter and waste management costs.

The League board of directors at its meeting on June 24-25 carefully reviewed eight ballot measures affecting cities expected to be on the November 2016 statewide ballot, adopting formal positions on four.

No position was taken on three measures and the board deferred action on one until it meets with Gov. Jerry Brown later this summer. The measures were previously reviewed by a number of League policy committees that forwarded recommendations to the board of directors for consideration.

Under the League of California Cities bylaws, the board may take a position supporting or opposing a statewide ballot measure only by a two-thirds vote of those directors present. This policy assures that any position taken reflects the broad consensus of League members.

Below each of the eight measures considered is listed with a brief summary, a link to the measure's full text and position taken.

[Proposition 51 California Public Education Facilities Bond Initiative.](#) This measure would authorize \$9 billion in general obligation bonds to fund construction of school facilities for K-12 schools and community colleges.

League position: No Position.

[Proposition 53 Revenue Bonds: Statewide Voter Approval. Constitutional Amendment.](#)

This measure would require statewide voter approval prior to the state issuing or selling any revenue bonds of \$2 billion or more for state projects that are financed, owned, operated or managed by the state or a joint agency created by or for the state.

League position: Oppose.

[Proposition 54 California Legislature Transparency Act of 2016.](#) This measure would prohibit the Legislature from passing legislation until it has been in print and published online for at least 72 hours prior to the vote unless it is a case of public emergency. The Legislature would be required to record all proceedings (except closed sessions) and make available online.

League position: Support.

[Proposition 57 Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act of 2016.](#) This measure: revises rules governing this disposition of juvenile offenders; allows non-violent offenders to seek parole after completing the full term of their primary offense without regard to any applicable sentencing enhancements that a judge added to their offence; and authorizes the Department of Corrections to revise regulations governing good time credits.

League position: Action deferred until after meeting with Governor Brown, the measure's sponsor.

[Proposition 63 Safety for All Act of 2016.](#) This measure requires, starting July 1, 2017, all people to report loss or theft of a firearm to local law enforcement within five days of discovering the loss, as well as any subsequent discovery within five days. It also further regulates the possession of large-capacity magazines, regulates Internet-based sales of ammunition, and regulates those who handle, sell, or deliver ammunition.

League position: No Position.

[Proposition 64 Marijuana Legalization. Initiative Statute.](#) This measure would legalize personal cultivation as well as state licensing of the commercial cultivation and retail sale of non-medical marijuana for personal use for adults 21 and over. Local agencies would be authorized to enact local ordinances for regulating, taxing or banning the commercial cultivation and sale of non-medical marijuana within the city or county.

League position: No Position.

[Proposition 65 Carry-Out Bags. Charges. Initiative Statute.](#) This measure would redirect money collected by grocery stores and other specified retail stores through sale of carryout bags under any state law banning free distribution of a certain kind of free carryout bag and mandating the sale of another type of carryout bag. It also requires collected funds to go to a Wildlife Conservation Board-administered fund

to be used for specified environmental projects.

League position: Oppose.

Proposition 67 Referendum to Overturn Ban on Single-Use Plastic Bags (SB 270, Padilla, 2014).

This referendum would repeal SB 270 (Padilla, 2014), which prohibited certain stores from distributing lightweight, single-use plastic bags and established requirements for reusable bags and prohibited stores from distributing reusable bags and recycled paper bags for less than \$0.10 per bag.

League position: Support (yes to retain plastic bag ban).

Proposition 65 Carry-Out Bags. Charges. Initiative Statute. This measure would redirect money collected by grocery stores and other specified retail stores through sale of carryout bags under any state law banning free distribution of a certain kind of free carryout bag and mandating the sale of another type of carryout bag. It also requires collected funds to go to a Wildlife Conservation Board-administered fund to be used for specified environmental projects.

League position: Oppose.

November 2016 Ballot Initiatives

Title	Description	Leadership Group Status
<p>Proposition 52 Medi-Cal Hospital Reimbursement Initiative</p>	<p>The federal government's Medicaid program helps pay for health care services provided to low-income patients. In California, this program is called Medi-Cal. In 2009, a hospital fee program was created to draw revenue, so that the state could match federal funding grants. This program has resulted in California hospitals receiving roughly \$2 billion a year in additional federal money to Medi-Cal. However, California has diverted some of the Medicaid matching funds to the state's general fund.</p> <p>If the initiative is approved by the state's voters, it will add language to the California Constitution to require voter approval of changes to the hospital fee program to ensure California uses these funds for the intended purpose of supporting hospital care to Medi-Cal patients.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support</p>
<p>Proposition 53 Public Vote on Bonds Initiative</p>	<p>A yes vote will be in favor of requiring voter approval before the state could issue more than \$2 billion in public infrastructure bonds that would require an increase in taxes or fees for repayment, while a no vote will be a vote against the voter approval requirement and in favor of continuing to allow the state to issue new debt without voter approval.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Oppose</p>
<p>Proposition 54 Government Accountability</p>	<p>Proposition 54 prohibits the legislature from passing any bill unless published on Internet for 72 hours before vote. It also requires the legislature to record its proceedings and post on Internet. Additionally, it authorizes the use of recordings. The fiscal impact includes a one-time costs of \$1 million to \$2 million and ongoing costs of about \$1 million annually to record legislative meetings and make videos of those meetings available on the Internet</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support</p>
<p>Proposition 56 Cigarette Tax</p>	<p>Increases cigarette tax by \$2.00 per pack, with equivalent increase on other tobacco products and electronic cigarettes containing nicotine. Fiscal Impact: Additional net state revenue of \$1 billion to \$1.4 billion in 2017-18, with potentially lower revenues in future years. Revenues would be used primarily to augment spending on health care for low-income Californians.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support</p>
<p>Proposition 58 Multilingual Education Act</p>	<p>The measure was designed to repeal the sheltered English immersion requirement and waiver provisions required by Proposition 227, and, instead, require that school districts and county offices of education shall provide English learners with a structured English immersion program.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support</p>

Proposition 61 The “Drug Price Relief Act” Initiative	This initiative was designed to restrict the amount that any state agency could pay for drugs, tying it to the price paid by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, an organization that falls under certain state laws regarding drug price negotiations. The measure would apply in any case in which the state ultimately provides funding for the purchase of drugs, even if the drugs are not purchased directly by a government agency.	Oppose
Proposition 67 Plastic Bag Ban Referendum	A yes vote is a vote in favor of upholding or ratifying the contested legislation banning plastic bags that was enacted by the California State Legislature, while a no vote is in favor of overturning the plastic bag ban. If approved, large grocery stores and pharmacies would be prohibited from providing plastic single-use carryout bags and ban small grocery stores, convenience stores and liquor stores from doing so the following year.	Support

November 2016 Ballot Initiatives

Title	Those in Favor	Those Opposed
<p>Proposition 52 Medi-Cal Hospital Reimbursement Initiative</p>	<p>California Hospital Association (Sponsor), California Children’s Hospital Association, Hospital Association of Southern California, Hospital Council of Northern & Central California, Alta Bates Summit Medical Center, El Camino Hospital, Dignity Health, Kaiser Permanente, Sutter Health, State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, California Business Roundtable, California Chamber of Commerce, Chamber of Commerce Mountain View, Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Jose Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce, & Silicon Valley Chamber Coalition</p>	<p>SEIU-UHW</p>
<p>Proposition 53 Public Vote on Bonds Initiative</p>	<p>Dean Cortopassi, Joan Cortopassi, Stop Blank Checks Committee</p>	<p>Gov. Jerry Brown, California Chamber of Commerce, State Building and Construction Trades Council</p>
<p>Proposition 54 Government Accountability</p>	<p>California Common Cause, League of Women Voters of California, California NAACP, California Forward, First Amendment Coalition, California Business Roundtable, Californians Aware, National Federation of Independent Business, California Chamber of Commerce, California Black Chamber of Commerce, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, California Taxpayers Association, Latin Business Association, Fresno Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, California Business Properties Association, San Jose/Silicon Valley NAACP, La Raza Roundtable de California, Hispanic 100, The R Street Institute, Monterey County Business Council, Valley Contractors Exchange, Small Business Action Committee</p>	<p>The California Labor Federation & The California Democratic Party^[7]</p>
<p>Proposition 56 Cigarette Tax</p>	<p>American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, American Heart Association, American Lung Association, California Medical Association, California Dental Association, and California Hospital Association</p>	<p>Philip Morris USA Inc.R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company</p>
<p>Proposition 58 Multilingual Education Act</p>	<p>Sen. Ricardo Lara, Sen. Loni Hancock, Sen. Bill Monning, Sen. Martin Block, Asm. Nancy Skinner, Asm. Lorena Gonzalez, San Jose Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce, Advance project, California Teachers Association</p>	<p>Ron Unz, advocate for Proposition 227, Mauro E. Mujica, U.S. English Chairperson</p>

<p>Proposition 61 The “Drug Price Relief Act” Initiative</p>	<p>Sen. Bernie Sanders, AIDS Healthcare Foundation, Californians for Lower Drug Prices,</p>	<p>Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, Johnson & Johnson, Inc. Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals</p>
<p>Proposition 67 Plastic Bag Ban Referendum</p>	<p>Gov. Jerry Brown, Secretary Alex Padilla, Sen. Kevin De Leon, Sen. Ricardo Lara, Asm. Rob Bonta, Asm. Kevin McCarty, Asm. Marc Levine, Santa Clara County, California Coastal Commission,</p>	<p>California Manufacturer’s and Technology Association, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Stop the Bag Ban, The Dow Chemical Company, and Advanced Polybag, Inc.</p>



THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

RECOMMENDS

November 8, 2016 GENERAL ELECTION

More info: bit.ly/LWVCBallotRecs

PROP 51 School Bonds: K-12 and Community College YES

All California's schoolchildren deserve school facilities in good repair and equipped to provide all students a 21st century education. In a perfect world with adequate funding, we wouldn't need to borrow to build. However, this is not a perfect world, and our facilities needs are massive and require a large infusion of funding. It has been eight years since the last statewide bond measure was passed. Chronic underfunding from the state leaves most public school communities unable to adequately address their needs, increasing the danger of greater disparities among them. Many have passed local bonds but due to insufficient state matching funds, that money remains unspent—a situation this bond measure will help remedy.

PROP 54 California Legislature Transparency Act YES

Prop 54 will make our state government more open, honest, and accountable. With this common-sense reform, every bill must be in print and posted online for at least 72 hours before it may pass out of either house—preventing last-minute, closed-door changes. A video recording of every public meeting of the Legislature must be posted online in a timely way. Our democracy is stronger when more people participate, and this measure empowers all people to review, debate, and contribute to the laws that impact us all.

PROP 55 Children's Education and Health Care Protection Act YES

Proposition 55 is key in maintaining economic recovery and growth in California by continuing the current income tax rates on the wealthiest two percent of Californians, established by the voters in 2012. That measure, Prop 30, has moved California toward financial stability and adequate funding for education and other services we depend on like health care. Without Prop 55 we will be back to the days of pink slips for teachers, overcrowded classrooms, and community college students waiting years for the classes they need.

PROP 57 Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act YES

This measure restores the authority of judges, not prosecutors, to decide if juveniles as young as 14 should be tried in adult court, a right judges had until 2000. The prosecution may file a motion, but the court decides. Proposition 57 will also reduce the state prison population and costs by allowing earlier parole of nonviolent felons, with sentence credits for good behavior and rehabilitation or education. This measure could save tens of millions of dollars.

PROP 58 English Proficiency. Multilingual Education YES

Proposition 58 repeals the most restrictive parts of Proposition 227, a 1998 initiative that limited the methods California schools can use to teach English to students who are not native English speakers. This measure addresses the inequity of Prop 227 and frees parents and their schools to provide the best educational opportunities for all California children regardless of their first language. The League opposed Prop 227 nearly 20 years ago and urges your support for this change.

PROP 59 Constitutional Amendment Advisory Measure NO

Eliminating the corrupting influence of money in our democracy is a vital concern. Unfortunately, this vague, poorly drafted ballot measure is not the solution. A constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United* may have appeal as a quick fix, but in reality it is a slow, laborious, costly, and potentially unsuccessful strategy. A poorly written amendment could have significant unintended consequences—not the least of which is squelching actual political speech. Voters deserve a fair election system today, not years or decades from now. Instead of looking to an imagined silver bullet, we need to take broad action now, including fixing our Federal Elections Commission, expanding disclosure laws, overturning California's ban on public financing of elections, and asking a new Supreme Court to revisit the ruling.

VOTE WITH THE LEAGUE ON NOVEMBER 8!

8/8/2016

PROP 62 Justice That Works: Death Penalty Abolition YES

Proposition 62 will **abolish** the death penalty, replacing it with life without possibility of parole. It will ensure time in prison is spent in work, with an increased portion of wages going to restitution to victims' families. Families deserve restitution, not endless legal appeals, and closure through knowing these worst criminals will never be released. California has spent more than \$5 billion to execute 13 people since 1978. Nothing indicates this has been effective in reducing crime, while the risk of executing the innocent remains.

PROP 66 Shortening Death Penalty Appeals NO

This poorly written measure would greatly increase California's risk of executing an innocent person by shortening the time for appeals and limiting the prisoner's ability to present new evidence of their innocence. Raising significant constitutional issues, this could cause more delays, increase taxpayers' costs, and add layers of bureaucracy. It is estimated the state would need as many as 400 new taxpayer-funded attorneys to meet the demand. The wise choice is **NO on 66** and **YES on 62** to save costs, provide restitution, and prevent executing innocent people.

PROP 63 Safety for All Act YES

The facts are sobering. From 2002 to 2013, 38,576 Californians died from gun violence, including 2,258 children. In the U.S., more than 300 Americans are shot **each day**, more than 80 of them **fatally**. Prop 63 helps counter those statistics by strengthening background check systems and ensuring that California law enforcement shares data about dangerous people with the FBI. It ensures that dangerous criminals and domestic abusers sell or transfer their firearms after they're convicted. This measure requires businesses that sell ammunition to report lost or stolen ammunition, requires people to notify law enforcement if their guns are lost or stolen, and ensures that people convicted of gun theft are ineligible to own guns.

PROP 65 Sowing Confusion about the Plastic Bag Ban NO

Don't be confused by this deceptive measure—vote NO. Large players in the plastic bag industry spent millions to put this disingenuous initiative on the ballot, creating a distraction that could thwart California's efforts to rein in plastic bag waste and litter. The plastic bag industry wants to use this measure to damage the hard-won agreement between environmentalists and grocers that made the plastic bag ban possible. This is not about helping fund environmental programs but is simply intended to cause enough voter confusion that the more significant environmental measure, Proposition 67, fails. Don't be confused; **Vote NO on 65** and **Vote YES on 67**.

PROP 67 Protect California's Plastic Bag Ban YES

The League urges a YES vote on Proposition 67 to retain California's plastic bag ban. The question on a referendum is not intuitive; you are being asked if you want to retain the new law. Vote YES to keep the 2014 statewide law prohibiting single-use carryout bags. These plastic film bags pollute our oceans, pose a deadly threat to marine wildlife, clutter our landscapes, create toxic byproducts when manufactured, and are very difficult to recycle. California grocers and other retailers support the ban, and many cities and counties have local measures that are working. Don't let out-of-state plastic bag industry players stop our progress!

NO RECOMMENDATION ON THE OTHER MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

PROP 56 Cigarette Tax NEUTRAL

Proposition 56 establishes an increased tax on cigarettes, with the money collected from this tax earmarked for health care and tobacco use prevention. The League does not generally support earmarks but is **neutral** on this measure because of the benefits from reducing smoking and the increased funding for health care.

Because League positions do not cover the issues in the following measures, the LWVC is taking **no stand** on **Prop 52** (State Fees on Hospitals. Federal Medi-Cal Matching Funds), **Prop 53** (Revenue Bonds. Statewide Voter Approval), **Prop 60** (Adult Films. Condoms. Health Requirements), **Prop 61** (State Prescription Drug Purchases. Pricing Standards), and **Prop 64** (Marijuana Legalization).

VOTE WITH THE LEAGUE ON NOVEMBER 8!